

TED KACZYNSKI  
to  
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

October 19, 1999

#90

Dear Beau,

I quote from some of your letters to me:

7/19/99, page 2, ¶12. "I know a guy named Steven Dubner who is writing an article about David and Linda P. provisionally entitled 'The Price of Morality,' which is critical of the couple and particularly of Linda. He described them ~~me~~ to me as 'angry Buddhists' and rightly hypothesizes that David went from your shadow to Linda's and that he has no backbone but much resentment."

8/2/99, page 1, ¶15. "Dubner called today. ... La Follette did reinforce the idea that David once held radical views. Dubner said that this was ancillary to his argument, but it would receive fair treatment as it applies to his thesis about the triangulation between you, David and Linda Patrik."

8/7/99, page 1, ¶12. "I had a long conversation with the Talk Magazine editor who is working on the article entitled 'The Price of Morality.' Here's what I learned: The article will portray you as a person guided by his own strict moral principles. It will make clear that you developed your own code of values and beliefs, and that they form a cogent system. It will then show how David once subscribed to a similar moral position. ..."

8/7/99, page 1, ¶13. "Dubner's focus is on

the relationship between you and your brother and how morality played a role in the decisions you each made. ... He plans to expose David's earlier radicalism and his journey toward an establishment mind set. ... [T]he editor told me that David has been recalcitrant during the interviews with Dubner. ... "

8/7/99, page 2, ¶ 2. "Talk [Magazine] wants to break the story about your brother's wishy-washy morals."

8/7/99, page 2, ¶ 4, page 3, ¶ 1. "Since [Dubner's] article represents a turning of the tide with regard to press coverage, it should, in my opinion, be accommodated. ... [W]e know what Talk is going to run ... . My opinion about the article is that it will be important; I think Dubner is on a par with William Finnegan."

8/7/99, page 3, ¶ 3. "Dubner interviewed [Joel] Schwartz and will comment on the meaning of David's opinions regarding schizophrenia. He was fascinated by the information from your book on that score."

~~Now compare the foregoing with what Dubner actually wrote in his article, which is just one~~

Dubner wrote in his letter to me of 8/2/99, page 1, ¶ 2-4: "I was particularly surprised by the influence that Linda has

always exercised over David's decision-making and David's very complicated feelings for you, which seem to have vacillated between love and hatred. ... [M]uch of what you write about David (and Linda) seems to corroborate my own impressions. ... I would especially like you to be able to explain directly to me and to readers your feelings about and your experiences with David, especially such statements as 'David has never had any fixed attitudes, beliefs, or principles.'"

\* \* \*

Now compare the foregoing with what Dubner actually wrote in his article, which, as is customary in the media, portrays me insultingly and Dave and Linda as almost saintly.

As I assume you realize, the reason why I agreed to let Dubner interview me was that, on the basis of what he wrote to me and apparently told you, and your belief that he could be trusted,<sup>1</sup> I thought he would provide independent support for my conclusions about Dave's and Linda's motivations and the relationship between Dave and Linda. But he does no such thing. He says nothing about Dave's dependence on Linda, and everything substantial

---

1. You certainly conveyed the impression that Dubner could be trusted. Only in your letter of September 19 — long after the interview was over — did you express reservations.

that he says about Dave's resentment is accompanied by phrases like, "Ted said...", so that all he does is mention my opinion without providing any support for it. In fact, he discourages the reader from taking my opinion seriously, since he describes Dave and Linda as "honorable" and me as "cruel," "self-important," and "manipulative." Given the documentation available to him in Truth versus Lies, I can only assume that he designed the article to suit his own journalistic purpose rather than to give the best attainable approximation to the truth.

This interview is disastrous. Many hit-pieces about me have been written before, but this one is very much worse, because the fact that Dubner has interviewed me gives his words vastly more authority than they would have otherwise. And you tell me in your letter of October 11 that Dubner is now going to give at least one TV interview, through which he will no doubt propagate further misrepresentations of my motives and characterizations of me as "trouble," "cruel," "self-important," and "manipulative," while portraying Dave and Linda as noble and moral.

In your October 11 letter you wrote, "Overall, I think the piece Dubner published was good." I would appreciate it if you would go over each of the statements that I

quoted above, pages 1-3, and explain to me how those statements were fulfilled in Dubner's article.

What disturbs me is not so much the fact that you advised me to trust Dubner. That might have meant only that you screwed up and got "took". I too screwed up and got "took", ~~than~~ since I should have had more sense than to take your advice about Dubner. What really disturbs me is the fact that you say Dubner's piece is "good". From this fact I can only conclude that either (1) you read the piece very carelessly; (2) you don't want to admit that you screwed up in advising me to trust Dubner; or (3) your conception of the kind of publicity that should be made for Truth versus Lies is one that is unfavorable to me and that portrays Dave and Linda as only a little less than saints—in defiance of certain facts documented in Truth versus Lies.

Best regards,

Ted